**DOCUMENT RESUME**

ED 169 846 HE 011 221

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Stafford, Thomas H., Jr. |
| TITLE | Academic Dishonesty at North Carolina State University: A Student-Faculty Response. |
| INSTITUTION | North Carolina State Univ., Raleigh. Div. of Student Affairs. |
| PUB DATE | Feb 76 |
| NOTE | 22p.; Not available in paper copy due to marginal legibility of original document ; Best copy available |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Academic Standards; *Cheating; College Faculty; *College Students; Higher Education; Institutional Research; Moral Issues; Plagiarism; Research Projects; *School Surveys; *State Universities; *Student Reaction; *Teacher Attitudes |
| IDENTIFIERS | *North Carolina State University |

ABSTRACT

Academic honesty/dishonesty at North Carolina State University was studied through a survey of undergraduate students and teaching faculty at the beginning of the fall 1975 semester. Information is presented on the percentage of students who have cheated, faculty estimation of cheating, estimated percentage of cheating falling into selected categories, major reasons why students cheated, and reaction to cheating by students and faculty. A sample of faculty comments on academic honesty/dishonesty are appended. Major findings include: approximately 8-10 percent of undergraduates cheated during the 1974-75 academic year; students and faculty agree that a majority of all dishonesty involves either cheating during testing or plagiarism; and approximately one-fourth of both students and faculty said that a certain percentage will cheat regardless of classroom or other conditions. Student reaction to observed cheating is largely indifference. Faculty are much more likely to take some action, but this primarily includes handling the case individually without reporting it to the campus judicial system. Survey questions are appended. (SW)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED169846

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AT NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

## A STUDENT-FACULTY RESPONSE

Thomas H. Stafford, Jr.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Thomas Stafford

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

HE 011 221

Student Affairs Planning and Research

February, 1976

## SUMMARY

Findings in the following report on academic honesty/dishonesty at N. C. State University are based on survey data collected from undergraduate students and from teaching faculty at the beginning of the fall 1975 semester. Approximately 61% of the student sample and 40% of the faculty responded.

Major findings include:

1. Around 8-10% of NCSU undergraduates cheated during the 1974-75 academic year. This percentage is probably lower than that for high schools from which our freshmen come, is equal to that in colleges and universities from which our transfer students come, and, finally, has not substantially increased or decreased during the past three - five years.

2. Students and faculty agree that a majority of all cheating involves either activity during testing (copying from others or from crib sheets or giving aid) or plagarism. Students, however, felt that theft of exams, fraud, and receipt of stolen exams constituted a much larger proportion of all cheating than did faculty.

3. When asked to indicate the main reason why students cheat, approximately one-fourth of both the students and the faculty said that a certain percentage will cheat regardless of classroom or other conditions. Next in order for students were factors outside the university: pressure for graduate school admission, parental pressure, and pressure for employment. However, next in order for faculty were lack of tradition of having a strong honor code system and crowded classes.

4. Student reaction to observed cheating is largely indifference. Nine of ten indicate they would not report cheating, primarily because they didn't want to get involved or didn't care. Faculty are much more likely to take some action but this primarily includes handling the case individually without reporting it to the campus judicial system.

5. When asked about the importance of academic honesty as an objective for the University, faculty members assign it a high priority; however, they generally fail to express this attitude to their classes by reviewing expected standards of academic honesty.

# ACADEMIC DISHONESTY AT NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

## A STUDENT-FACULTY RESPONSE

### Introduction

The following report has been developed to provide data for use by the Chancellors Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Misconduct, appointed in spring 1975 to study and make recommendations on this topic.

Data shown in the report were generated by student and faculty responses to surveys developed by the Committee. The Student Survey (Appendix A) was given to a random sample of 791 regular undergraduate students during registration for the Fall, 1975 semester and was completed by 61.3% of the sample. The Faculty Survey (Appendix B) was sent to the campus address of 1,433 teaching faculty members including teaching assistants, but excluding faculty who had not previously taught at NCSU, and was returned through campus mail to the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee. Completed surveys were received from 40.3% of the teaching faculty with response rates ranging from a low of 16.7 for the school of Design to a high of 49.0 for the school of Agriculture and Life Sciences. Both surveys were anonymous and did not include a follow-up. A comparison of respondents to the population as shown in Table 1 indicates that, with the exception of a few categories, respondents are generally representative of the population for the variables shown. The low faculty response rate, although typical of other surveys of faculty on this campus, does result in the possibility of a non-response bias which should be kept in mind as the faculty results are reviewed. The faculty survey included an opportunity for open ended comments about academic honesty on this campus. These comments may be obtained for review through the committee.

### Survey Results

What is the extent of academic misconduct at NCSU?

An initial concern was to determine the percentage of NCSU students who have been involved in cheating. Survey responses to the question, "What is your perception of the percentage of students enrolled in courses with you (or in your department, for faculty) who cheated during the previous academic year?" are shown for five different groups in Table 2. Three

student categories are shown to provide a comparison of student perception from three different settings. Since responses to this question were provided at the beginning of the fall semester, responses labeled "freshmen" reflect the extent of cheating in high schools from which entering NCSU freshmen have graduated the year before, those labeled "transfer" reflect the perception of cheating in those colleges and universities from which NCSU students transfer, and those labeled "continuing (cont)" reflect the extent of cheating at NCSU. NCSU faculty members' perception of the proportion of students who cheated is provided for both teaching assistants (TA) and for teachers with faculty rank.

As shown in Table 2, responses of NCSU continuing students indicate that about 10% of NCSU students cheated during the preceeding year. In contrast, NCSU faculty members indicate that only about 5-6% of students in their classes cheated. The percentage of students who TAs feel cheated is slightly higher than for ranked faculty.

In a later section of the faculty survey, teachers were asked to indicate the percentage of students observed in their classes who they are certain were cheating and secondly who may have been cheating. These results, shown in Table 3, parallel very closely the faculty responses on the previous question and substantiate faculty perception that about 5% of NCSU students cheat. On this question also, TA's reported a slightly higher percentage than did ranked faculty. If it is assumed that faculty and students have responded honestly, the difference between responses for these two groups raises the question of which group is more accurate. As will be discussed in more detail in the next section, Table 4 provides an indication that the student response of 10% may be more accurate since students report higher frequencies of cheating in categories which faculty members would frequently not observe (e.g., theft of exams, receipt of stolen exams, and fraud).

Also of interest as shown in Table 2, is the higher reported percentage of students who cheated in high school (18.6%) and a level of cheating (10.6%) reported in other colleges and universities which is similar to that for NCSU.

A final point presented in Table 3 is that NCSU faculty feel that cheating has not become either more or less frequent during the past 3-5 years.

In summary, data from the surveys indicate that probably around 8-10% of NCSU undergraduates cheated during the 1974-75 academic year, that this percentage

is probably lower than that for the high schools from which our freshmen come and equal to that in colleges and universities from vnich our transfers come, and finally that this percentage has not substantially increased or decreased during the past 3-5 years.

What type of cheating occurs?

When asked to indicate the proportion of all cheating which fell into selected categories, there was once again a difference between student and faculty responses. Table 4 summarizes responses to this question. For both students and faculty, copying information from another person's exam or test paper was easily the most frequent type of cheating reported, however, the percentage reported by faculty was almost twice as large as the student response.

Next in order for both groups were "plagarism," "copying from crib sheets or textbooks," and "giving aid on an exam or quiz." Not only were these in the same rank order for each group, the average percentages for each category were very similar for students and faculty.

There was additional disagreement not on the rank order but on the magnitude of three final categories: theft of exams, fraud, and receipt of stolen exams. Faculty members indicated that only 1% of all cheating fell into each of these categories (3% total) compared to 19% assigned by students to these three combined. Those data suggest that a substantial level of all cheating is successfully completed in these areas without faculty detection.

Even so, students and faculty agree that a large majority of all cheating (at least 77%) involved either activity during testing (copying from others or from crib sheets or giving aid) or plagarism.

Why do students cheat?

When asked to pick the major reason why students cheat, students and faculty continued to express some disagreement (see Table 5). Approximately one-fourth of both groups said the main reason was that a certain percentage of students will cheat regardless of classroom or other conditions. For students, the next most frequently selected reasons concerned pressure from outside the university: "to be admitted to graduate school," "from parents," and "for employment." None of these were the next highest reasons for faculty, although pressure for employment was close. After "a certain percentage will cheat regardless," faculty reasons were: "lack of a traditionally strong honor system," "crowded classes," and "other" (lazy, didn't study, to obtain higher grades). Very small proportions

of students felt that crowded classes or lack of sufficient monitors were major reasons. Beyond the general agreement that there will always be a certain level of cheating, it is of interest to note that students tend to attribute cheating to "outside" factors which are generally out of the control of an individual campus, while faculty members more likely acknowledge "institutional" factors which can be addressed by an individual campus (strong honor code tradition, crowded conditions).

What is the reaction to cheating and why?

A question of major importance concerns the action, if any, taken by those who observe cheating; and, for those who fail to report cheating, why they do so. Survey responses which relate to these questions are shown in Tables 6 and 7.

Almost one-fourth of all students said they would do nothing and would not be disturbed if they observed another student cheating, and almost one half said they would do nothing but would be disturbed. At the other end of possible action, only 7% would report but not identify the student, while only 3% would actually report the student to the judicial system.

When asked why observed cheating has not been reported, approximately 70% said they didn't want to get involved or didn't care. Another 19% indicated they didn't know how or to whom to report.

Faculty, on the other hand, are more likely to say that they would report cheating to the judicial system although the proportion for this group is not higher either. Fourteen percent said they would report cheating, 17% said they would not and 68% said that "it would depend." The following factors would apparently influence this decision:

| | |
|---|---|
| if the case appears difficult to prove | 88% |
| feel situations can be handled better individually on one to one basis | 82% |
| if the student admitted guilt and asked for leniency | 70% |

Other factors which have less or very little influence (e.g., don't care if students cheat, 3%) are shown in Table 6.

Table 7 summarizes responses from a subset of the total faculty: those who have observed cheating. From the data shown in this table, it is obvious that faculty members take some action when they are certain cheating has

occurred, but this action is not likely to include reporting the incident to the judicial system. Only 9% ignored and only 4% reported certain cheating. The great majority of these cases were handled individually with a tendency to provide some type of academic penalty.

In almost 4 of 10 observed cases of possible cheating, the incident was ignored. Slightly less than 10% were handled individually and given an academic penalty while the remainder were likely to be handled individually without an academic penalty. None of these cases were reported to the judicial system.

What is the importance of academic honesty?

Having assessed the extent and types of cheating as well as reaction to it, a final concern is whether or not academic honesty is an important objective for NCSU and to what extent is it emphasized by faculty. In Table 8, faculty responses to the question "should the promotion of academic honesty be an important objective for the university?" are shown. Overwhelmingly, faculty assign a very strong importance to this objective. Slightly over 8 out of 10 said academic honesty should be as important as other university objectives or that every effort should be made to accomplish this goal.

This attitudinal position, however, seems to be at odds with faculty activity as shown in the other sections of Table 8. When students were asked to indicate the percentage of their NCSU teachers who had reviewed standards of academic honesty expected in their classes, the overall percentage was low (18.4%)

Responding to the same question, faculty members indicate a somewhat higher percentage (e.g., 35% say they always review standards at the beginning of the term) but almost one-half say they never review standards.

On the final item in Table 8, 80% of the faculty say they never use an honor pledge on quizzes or exams and 8% indicate they always do so.

These data indicate that NCSU faculty members attach a strong importance to academic honesty but they generally fail to express this attitude to their classes.

TABLE 1

RESPONDENTS-POPULATION COMPARISONS

| Students | | Respondents | Population |
|---|---|---|---|
| Sex | | | |
| Male | | 71.1% | 75.0% |
| Female | | 28.9 | 25.0 |
| | N | 481 | 13,051 |
| Classification | | | |
| New Freshmen | | 21.5% | 22.7% |
| New transfer | | 5.0 | 5.5 |
| Sophomore | | 28.2 | 32.4 |
| Junior | | 20.0 | 19.6 |
| Senior | | 24.4 | 19.3 |
| | N = | 475 | 12,964 |
| Faculty | | | |
| Ag. & L.S. | | 25.8% | 21.2% |
| Design | | 1.6 | 3.8 |
| Education | | 5.0 | 5.4 |
| Engineering | | 17.9 | 18.2 |
| Forest Resources | | 4.0 | 3.4 |
| Liberal Arts | | 21.7 | 26.6 |
| P.A.M.S. | | 21.0 | 18.1 |
| Textiles | | 2.8 | 3.4 |
| | N = | 577 | 1,433 |

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WHO HAVE CHEATED

| | Student Responses | | | | Faculty Responses | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | FR[a] | TR[b] | Cont[c] | TOTAL | TA[d] | FAC | TOTAL |
| None cheated | 12.8 | 25.0 | 25.9 | 23.1 | 22.0 | 26.5 | 25.4 |
| Less than 5% | 18.6 | 32.1 | 24.8 | 23.9 | 54.2 | 40.4 | 41.0 |
| 5 - 15% | 25.5 | 17.9 | 29.9 | 28.3 | 35.6 | 25.9 | 26.3 |
| 16 - 25% | 17.7 | 7.1 | 10.1 | 11.6 | 8.5 | 5.5 | 5.7 |
| 26 - 35% | 12.7 | 7.1 | 4.2 | 6.2 | 1.7 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| 36 - 45% | 3.9 | 10.1 | 2.3 | 3.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| More than 45% | 8.9 | 0 | 2.8 | 3.9 | 0 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| N = | 102 | 28 | 355 | 485 | 72 | 475 | 547 |
| Total % who cheated | 18.6 | 10.6 | 10.0 | 11.9 | 7.4 | 5.5 | 5.6 |

[a] New freshmen entering NCSU

[b] New transfer students entering NCSU

[c] NCSU continuing students

[d] Teaching assistants

TABLE 3

FACULTY ESTIMATION OF CHEATING

| | Teaching Assistants | Faculty | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| During the past academic year, what percentage of students enrolled in your classes did you observe who you *are certain* were cheating? | 1.9% | 1.3% | 1.4% |
| What percentage of students did you observe who *may have* been cheating? | 4.9 | 3.6 | 3.7 |
| TOTAL | 6.8 | 4.9 | 5.1 |
| N = | 73 | 502 | 575 |

| In your opinion, compared to 3-5 years ago, is cheating in your department... | |
|---|---|
| More frequent | 7.0% |
| About the same | 51.0 |
| Less frequent | 6.0 |
| Cannot tell | 36.0 |
| N = | 552 |

TABLE 4

ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE OF CHEATING WHICH FALLS INTO SELECTED CATEGORIES

| | Students | Faculty |
|---|---|---|
| Copying | 26% | 48% |
| Plagarism | 19 | 19 |
| Crib Sheets | 18 | 14 |
| Giving Aid | 14 | 12 |
| Receipt of stolen exams | 8 | 1 |
| Theft of exams | 6 | 1 |
| Fraud | 5 | 1 |
| Other | 3 | 4 |
| | 99 | 100 |
| N = | 306 | 410 |

TABLE 5

MAJOR REASON WHY STUDENTS CHEATED

| Reason | Students | Faculty |
|---|---|---|
| Certain percentage will cheat regardless of classroom conditions | 23% | 24% |
| Pressure for graduate school admission | 17 | 9 |
| Parental pressure | 13 | 2 |
| Pressure for employment | 12 | 10 |
| Lack of tradition of having a strong honor code system | 10 | 21 |
| Other (Lazy - didn't study/to get good grade) | 8 | 14 |
| Availability of previous tests and other materials | 6 | 3 |
| Maintain eligibility for participation in sports, financial aid, or other activity | 5 | 1 |
| Crowded classes - not enough room for alternating seats for exams | 5 | 16 |
| Lack of sufficient monitors or proctors | 1 | 1 |
| | 100 | 101 |
| N = | 349 | 413 |

TABLE 6

REACTION TO CHEATING

Students

If you observed another student cheating, what would your probable reaction be?

| | |
|---|---|
| Not disturbed - do nothing | 23% |
| Be disturbed - do nothing | 43 |
| Depend on who the student is | 14 |
| Express concern to student | 10 |
| Report - but not identify student | 7 |
| Report student | 3 |
| | 100 |
| *N* = | *466* |

If you have ever observed, but failed to report an incident of cheating at NCSU, what was your main reason for doing so?

| | |
|---|---|
| Person was a friend | 10% |
| Didn't know to whom to report | 19 |
| Didn't want to get involved | 36 |
| Didn't care | 35 |
| | 100 |
| *N* = | *261* |

Faculty

If you observe or think that cheating has taken place, would you report the incident to the NCSU Judicial System?

| | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 14% |
| It would depend | 68 |
| No | 17 |
| | 99 |
| *N* = | *546* |

Which of the following factors would influence your decision not to report a cheating violation to the Judicial System? (Percent responding "Yes")

| | |
|---|---|
| If the case appears difficult to prove | 88% |
| Feel situations can be handled better individually on a one to one basis | 82 |
| If the student admitted guilt and asked for leniency | 70 |
| If the case involved a first-time offerder in your class | 61 |
| Involvement with the Judicial System is too time consuming | 45 |
| Teacher is placed on trial | 44 |
| Don't feel Judicial System is effective or handles cases properly | 42 |
| Dislike adversary role | 34 |
| Sanctions given are inadequate | 31 |
| Don't want to adversely affect student | 29 |
| Don't wish to prepare evidence | 21 |
| Don't know how or to whom to report | 21 |
| If the student is prominent | 5 |
| Don't care if students cheat | 3 |

TABLE 7

FACULTY REACTION TO CHEATING

| Action Taken | Observed students who you are certain were cheating | Observed students who may have been cheating |
|---|---|---|
| Report to Judicial System | 4% | 0% |
| Handle and give academic penality | 46 | 8 |
| Handle and give no penalty | 22 | 32 |
| Handle and take following action | 20 | 22 |
| Ignore | 9 | 38 |
| | 101 | 100 |
| N = | 410 | 410 |

TABLE 8

IMPORTANCE OF ACADEMIC HONESTY

1. Faculty response to "Should the promotion of academic honesty be an important objective for this university?"

| | |
|---|---|
| No | 1% |
| Moderately important | 13 |
| Important | 45 |
| Very Important | 41 |
| | 100 |
| N = | 559 |

2. Students

Have NCSU faculty members reviewed standards of academic honesty expected in their classes?

| | |
|---|---|
| None | 17% |
| Less than 10% | 32 |
| 10 - 25% | 17 |
| 26 - 50% | 15 |
| More than 50% | 18 |
| N = | 327 |
| Total | 18.4% who have reviewed |

3. Faculty

During the previous year did you review standards of academic honesty expected?

| | Beginning of term | Before quizzes or tests | Before mid-term exams | Before final exams | During the previous year did you use an honor pledge on quizzes or exams |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Always | 35% | 20% | 20% | 29% | 8% |
| Sometimes | 17 | 36 | 30 | 25 | 13 |
| Never | 48 | 44 | 49 | 45 | 80 |
| | 100 | 100 | 99 | 99 | 101 |

APPENDIX C

A SAMPLE OF NCSU FACULTY COMMENTS ON ACADEMIC HONESTY/DISHONESTY

Academic honesty cannot be isolated from any other form of honesty. As professors, we should be concerned about the learning environment, if cheating disrupts that environment--we cannot do our work effectively. On the contrary, "Policing" exams or excessive emphasis on cheating may also disrupt the learning environment. An atmosphere of mutual trust between the professor and student is an ideal worth striving for.

It would be a nice world if everybody was honest, but I don't think academic honesty can be promoted.

1) Give guidelines for prosecution to faculty
2) Make it effective (trial)
3) Safeguard teacher and student rights to fair trial
4) Strong punishment

The moral and ethical standards and values of the student will determine whether the student cheats. By the time the student reaches the University his character has been formed. The honor code is no deterrent to those inclined to cheat. Drop it. Give the faculty the authority to handle cheating as they see fit.

Believe the most effective way to prevent cheating is to handle and monitor exams in such a way that it is a high risk situation, and not to put students "on their honor." Although it is easier for some than others, I spread my class out in a large room with nothing in front of them but exam and "blue book," and continually watch them like a hawk, but in an unobtrusive manner. Beyond this one tries to convey the philosophy that exams are an important learning book and should be taken in a positive, constructive spirit, etc.

Suspend students who are caught cheating, or at least put them on sheet probation. If I catch one in my class, I'll give him a "no credit" grade automatically and will report him to the Judicial System.

Crowded classrooms increase temptation and opportunity to cheat.

Promoting it should not be important, it should be expected from the students and they should be treated according to the belief they are honest. Those that are dishonest are going to cheat anyway unless someone is standing over them with a gun. To mistrust all students just because of a few I believe will result in more trying to cheat just to see if they can get around all the obstacles and the others feel like they are being treated like infants.

Crack down!!

Honor code. To be signed by all students on every exam. Stiff penalities for conviction of academic dishonesty.

Strictor enforcement of policy by individual professors - fewer classes/students - its impossible to watch everyone at once.

But there is much more to "academic honesty" than students cheating on test and papers. Unfair test questions, or poor responses to student's class questions (has it ever happened that a teacher faced with a good question to which the teacher can't respond properly say instead "If you had done your assigned reading, you wouldn't be wasting class time."?) A just as severe of an infringement of academic honesty as plagiarism on a student term paper. I think that a large part of intellectual honesty must be taught by example, and the faculty should be challenged to set higher standards by example of their conduct.

The size of the student body makes academic honesty difficult to maintain. Objective type exams are much easier to cheat on than essay type but in large classes essay exams are not practical.

Very difficult to know what action to take in view of the new individual rights laws and so forth--I would not want the hassle of a law suit where I have to invest time, etc. Yet, on the other hand, I don't want to be apathetic about all this. We need some guidance!!

You cannot introduce ideal standards if the administration is afraid of the students. They can only get A's and B's now. Junior members of the faculty and unfortunately many senior members are trying to please the students at the expense of academic standards. If they do, they will be better off (unfortunately) in the eyes of the administration (raises, promotions, or even distinguished faculty!).

The faculty should strive to demonstrate a high level of honesty and "fair-dealing" with his students. He should be human and kind in matters concerning a students integrity and to attempt to let positive growth from a negative situation.

Unless students understand why cheating is "wrong", and in fact are shown that in any society there are ethical and moral absolutes, then dishonesty and cheating will continue to grow. The only true (absolutely true) answer is not just through ethics, morality, or even religion, but through a personal relationship with God himself - the person of Jesus Christ.

The student should be tried by a panel of faculty members, not all from his department. Penalty should be imposed and recorded in his academic record.

I'd like to re-instate some type of pledge. The one I recall that many faculty and students liked was the one used at a west coast university. There, all exams were written in "blue books" a low-cost five or ten page paper bound exam book on the cover was a single printed statement below a signature line and this statement was: Honorable Conduct Observed.

That the Judicial System be abolished and each department give the authority to deal with academic dishonesty initially. The student should have the right of appeal only if the penalty is expulsion.

Try to develop attitude of mutual trust between members of university community by showing trust in students. Expect them not to cheat, mutilate library books, steal, etc. and many will respond in kind. Pledges, proctors, etc. are not the answer. Design course work for minimum temptation to cheat, i.e., remove sources of temptation. Put them on their own as much as possible. Don't be a cheat yourself.

Uniform standard operating procedure for each professor to tell students of policy at first class meeting. Instructors should patrol continually during exams. Exams should include more "thought" or essay type questions. More difficult to grade but more revealing.

Competition for grades/jobs perhaps tempts students to cheat more than ever now. During my 28 years here I used to follow suggestions to show trust in students by leaving the classroom during tests. I no longer do this except with graduate students and upper-level undergraduates who are writing essays. With others I remain in the classroom without conspicuously "checking." I also, in crowded classes, distribute questions in alternate fashion by front to back rows. I tell the students jokingly how tragic it would be to see someone's wrong answer and copy it! The students seem to understand and accept this good humoredly. For three years or so I have noticed very little of what might be cheating. The last few casses I handled on my own because: 1) felt I could reach the student more effectively, and 2) the Judicial Board "stigma" would crush him and his parents. In each case (three in recent years) the student was rehabilitated, adopted a greatly changed attitude, and indeed became a friend.

Hire administrators who will back teachers who are willing to work and to deny college credit to students who will not. I do not think the problem is the student body primarily. I think that primarily it is a matter of moral cowardice and apathy on the part of an increasing number of teachers and administrators. The grade inflation at NCSU in my view is just another result of the same problem. This view does not, I repeat, does not, reflect any lack of "love" for the students. On the contrary, I think they deserve, black or white, male or female, more of an intellectual and moral challange than they are finding on this campus.

Strong honor system would help.

Study other universities which have put forth major efforts to deal with cheating, e.g., University of Florida (proctored exams, elaborate honor court, statistical analysis of objective exams under suspicion, curved exams.) Cheating hurts good students, and through indoctrination of incoming freshmen with regard to above.

Every student should be able to pass an exam on the structure and goals of the NCSU Judicial System and on the nature of plagiarism, cheating, etc. including hypothetical cases, in their first semester. This was very effective at Rice University where I was an undergraduate.

I feel that students should be made more aware of the need to report cheating to professors, particularly in large classes where a great deal of cheating supposedly takes place. Many of them do not seem to be aware of the effect unchecked cheating has on the competitive standings of honest students. Perhaps a general bulletin and some Technician publicizing would help to get this point across. I do wish that some standards could be established for tutorial proceedings so that I can know that the themes my athletic students (in particular) write are not prepared and outlined by tutors. I have actually had one student request the topics early so that his tutor could have a little extra time to work up a paper for him! This is an example of integrity in cheating.

Each school should have its own judicial system, cheating in English is more complex frequently than cheating in chemistry, and it has more graduations. I do not have the time to explain these graduations to non LA faculty/students in a judicial hearing. Also need to define publically the standards within school more specifically.

I do not fractionate honesty into "academic" honesty and other honesty. Moral integrity should be a major educational goal, universally applicable. I strongly object to a reward system - perpetual in house grading which subjects students to an unconscionable, every-present and excessive temptation. A major campaign in the faculty should be launched to reduce temptation (opportunity) to cheat.

Unfortunately the burden of responsibility lies on the instructor. I want only to know that the University backs me in whatever action I feel appropriate. I feel that "cheating" outside of in-class exams is unavoidable; therefore, I take the attitude that students can learn from working together, but I grade almost nothing for work done outside of class, e.g., problem sets.

Given the nature of the university - large numbers - low standards for admission - will have a large number of cheaters unless proctored.

There is little hope that we can have a code of behavior in the University much different from that outside. We should, as far as we can, remove the opportunities for cheating.

Honesty has been instilled in students by the time they reach the University by influences in the home and community in which they lived. The universities role should be to support that effort through discussion and counseling.

Don't be so strict about guarding knowledge except during exams or quizzes. What do you want to keep the students from learning? Plagiarism is a different matter and so is fraud - they are clearly wrong.

No emphasis presently given by University. My one experience with a student taken to Judicial Board was most disappointing. The board itself seemed unmoved by overwhelming evidence.

Main problem is lack of reasonable sanctions available to Judicial Board. Present sanctions are either too drastic (suspension or expulsion) or too mild (restriction of priveleges, disciplinary probation or something less). Proper sanction ought to be academic in nature such as "NC" in course, zero on quiz, etc. but such sanctions are not available to Judicial Board. Dropping of course should not be allowed in such a case.

I believe most teachers and courses can devise testing procedures that make cheating extremely difficult. However, I also think there should be a strong honor code.

1) Should be made clear to student that teachers role is like that of a police officer giving a traffic ticket, not that of D.A. prosecuting a murder. Similarly the penalty must be more on the order of a fine than a death sentence.
2) Most effective means to stop cheating is to remove opportunity in the classroom. Budgets should allow for paper to be passed out to students instead of student using his own, etc.

1) Where possible design exams and problems for open book and open notes examination.
2) Emphasize (continually) the reasons for honesty.
3) Confront student one to one if he is cheating or suspected of cheating
4) Instead of penalities in grading or such, give re-exams or problems reworked.

Honesty is important to the functioning of society and the effectiveness of individuals. It's role is part of a mature citizen's education. Dishonesty cannot be eliminated, but that should be our goal. Cheating should be made harder and more risky on this campus.

Believe cheating can be substantially controlled by the instructor by (1) type problems - i.e., thinking vs memory, etc. (2) by security measures in the department.

A code is not needed - I feel that it would be ignored. The influences that cause cheating are, I feel, within social environments. A code may improve things, but probably only slightly. Actually, cheating is a minor problem for our program.

I believe the establishment of a strong honor code tradition is the best way to eliminate cheating. It creates a climate where the student is forced to be responsible to himself and account for his behavior.

The "honor" code is personally the most distasteful aspect of student integrity that I know. Students should not be expected to inform on each other (in my upbringing this was the vilest thing that anyone could do). Let the teacher discover the dishonesty and give him the tools to work it out with the student as much as possible.

Tradition is the most important factor in honor codes and systems. Schools and Universities at which there are working systems are proud of them. Students as well as faculty. It takes time and persistence - but it is worth it.

In 1974-75 this was not a problem in my classes. The steps taken to prevent cheating include (1) writing exam papers so that complex problems came first, thus students completed them at different times and could not easily copy answers; (2) spread out individuals in room as much as possible; (3) eagle-eye monitoring at all quizzes and exams.

I have heard of frequent cases of cheating in my department. As a result, four years ago I abondoned multiple choice type exams. I now give only open-book/ open notes essay exams stressing application of materials covered in class and readings. I proctor these exams carefully and have seen no evidence of cheating. This is a costly solution and not applicable to all courses, but it has worked well for me and I plan to continue it as long as my classes are less than 70 or 80.

"Justice" is too uneven left to individual faculty members but not all cases need a judicial system. (2) Require all incidents to be reported to heads and tell students (all) that is required. (3) Heads must discuss all cases with teachers and approve actions taken including forwarding to Judicial System.

Establishment of an "honor board" to handle cases of academic dishonesty only would be an important step in the right direction. Educate freshmen to understand that reporting cheating of a classmate is not "finking out", rather that it is expected of them, and that failure to report such is in itself a violation of an "Honor Code."

1) Do not put teacher on trial.
2) Use more proctoring for purposes of having witness to corroboate accusations, otherwise trial is waste of time.
3) Give meaningful sentences when guilt is established, not just a slap on the wrist.
4) PUBLICIZE the fact (not the name) so that work gets around that such actions (cheating, stealing, etc.) are delt with speedily and fairly.

I am not convenced cheating is as widespread as claimed. Even if it is, I believe the only thing the faculty can do is point out the student who cheats only cheats himself. If a student wants to cheat he or she will find a way to do it so it cannot be detected. In my student days extremely elaborate precautions were taken to prevent cheating to no avail. Cheating can only be prevented by the student, so the only recourse is to show the student he or she only penalizes themselves.

Forget the cards at registration - students ignore - waste of paper.